



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/203,223	11/30/1998	RAJESH KANUNGO	23668.001739	3941

22434 7590 01/16/2003

BEYER WEAVER & THOMAS LLP
P.O. BOX 778
BERKELEY, CA 94704-0778

EXAMINER

LONSBERRY, HUNTER B

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2611

DATE MAILED: 01/16/2003

14

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

B

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/203,223

Applicant(s)

KANUNGO, RAJESH

Examiner

Hunter B. Lonsberry

Art Unit

2611

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 04 December 2002.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-10 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-10 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 30 November 1998 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1,2, and 4-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent 6,163,316 to Killian in view of U.S. Patent 6,177,931-B1 to Alexander.

Regarding claim 1, Killian discloses a Java enabled television system which utilizes Java applets for controlling the display of video and other data within a webpage (column 3, lines 7-27, column 5, line 30-column 6, line 5, column 6, line 60-column 7, line 7), the Java applet receives user input via a Java enabled EPG (Figure 3, column 8, lines 36-40, column 13, lines 12-21), and calls via the applet the necessary API functions to control the display of video data on a web page. Killian inherently contains a PIP object and PIPInfo object which are utilized for the display and control of an EPG control panel as Java objects are essential for both the creation and operation of a Java applet and the communications of the applet with the hardware and software which it is being run on. Killian does not disclose the use of an applet where the video data is not integrated with the content of a web page. Alexander discloses in Figure 1, an EPG display 10 with a video window 12 in which video is not integrated with the displayed EPG content, the EPG content may be downloaded from an internet website (column 3, lines 1-20, column 8, lines 18-64). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one skilled

in the art at the time of invention to modify the java enabled TV system of Killian to control the video in a separate window as shown by Alexander thereby enabling a user to view preview a program and navigate programming simultaneously.

Regarding claim 2, Killian discloses a Java enabled TV system in which switching between TV and video input is controlled by a Java applet (column 4, lines 20-24, column 6, lines 77-31, column 7, lines 25-32).

Regarding claim 4, Killian discloses that the Java enabled TV system can turn the video on and off (column 6, line 60-column 7, line 7).

Regarding claim 5, Killian discloses that the Java enabled TV system can change the channel (column 13, lines 44-51).

Regarding claim 6, Killian discloses a Java enabled television system which utilizes Java applets for controlling the display of video and other data within a webpage (column 3, lines 7-27, column 5, line 30-column 6, line 5, column 6, line 60-column 7, line 7), the applet is created and run on processor 8 (Figure 1, column 3, lines 12-18) the Java applet receives user input via a Java enabled EPG (Figure 3, column 8, lines 36-40, column 13, lines 12-21) from buttons pressed on remote control 42, and calls via the applet the necessary API functions to control the display of video data on a web page on the TV/receiver hardware (column 6, line 60-column 7, line 7). Killian inherently contains a PIP object and PIPInfo object which are utilized for the display and control of an EPG control panel as Java objects are essential for both the creation and operation of a Java applet and its communications with the hardware and software which it is being run on. Killian does not disclose the use of an applet where the video data is not

integrated with the content of a web page. Alexander discloses in Figure 1, an EPG display 10 with a video window 12 in which video is not integrated with the displayed EPG content, the EPG content may be downloaded from an internet website (column 3, lines 1-20, column 8, lines 18-64). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of invention to modify the java enabled TV system of Killian to control the video in a separate window as shown by Alexander thereby enabling a user to view preview a program and navigate programming simultaneously.

Regarding claim 7 Killian discloses a Java enabled television system which utilizes Java coded applets for controlling the display of video and other data within a webpage (column 3, lines 7-27, column 5, line 30-column 6, line 5, column 6, line 60-column 7, line 7), the applet is created and run on processor 8 (Figure 1, column 3, lines 12-18), receives user input via a Java enabled EPG (Figure 3, column 8, lines 36-40, column 13, lines 12-21) from buttons pressed on remote control 42, and calls via the applet the necessary API functions to control the display of video data on a web page on the TV/receiver hardware (column 6, line 60-column 7, line 7). Killian inherently contains a PIP object and PIPInfo object which are utilized for the display and control of an EPG control panel as a Java objects are essential for both the creation and operation of a Java applet and its communications with the hardware and software which it is being run on. Killian does not disclose the use of an applet where the video data is not integrated with the content of a web page. Alexander discloses in Figure 1, an EPG display 10 with a video window 12 in which video is not integrated with the displayed EPG content, the EPG content may be downloaded from an internet website

(column 3, lines 1-20, column 8, lines 18-64). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of invention to modify the java enabled TV system of Killian to control the video in a separate window as shown by Alexander thereby enabling a user to view preview a program and navigate programming simultaneously.

Regarding claim 8, Killian discloses a Java enabled television system which utilizes Java applets for controlling the display of video and other data within a webpage (column 3, lines 7-27, column 5, line 30-column 6, line 5, column 6, line 60-column 7, line 7), the Java applet receives user input via a Java enabled EPG (Figure 3, column 8, lines 36-40, column 13, lines 12-21), and calls via the applet the necessary API functions to control the display of video data on a web page. Killian inherently contains a PIP object and PIPInfo object which are utilized for the display and control of an EPG control panel as Java objects are essential for both the creation and operation of a Java applet and the communications of the applet with the hardware and software which it is being run on. Killian does not disclose the use of an applet where the video data is not integrated with the content of a web page. Alexander discloses in Figure 1, an EPG display 10 with a video window 12 in which video is not integrated with the displayed EPG content, the EPG content may be downloaded from an internet website (column 3, lines 1-20, column 8, lines 18-64). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of invention to modify the java enabled TV system of Killian to control the video in a separate window as shown by Alexander thereby enabling a user to view preview a program and navigate programming simultaneously.

Regarding claim 9, Killian discloses a Java enabled TV system in which switching between TV and video input is controlled by a Java applet (column 4, lines 20-24, column 6, lines 77-31, column 7, lines 25-32).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 3 and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent 6,163,316 to Killian in view of 6,177,931-B1 to Alexander in further view of U.S. Patent 5,594,510 to Sakakibara.

Regarding claims 3 and 10, Killian discloses a Java enabled TV system in which switching between TV and video input is controlled by a Java applet (column 4, lines 20-24, column 6, lines 77-31, column 7, lines 25-32). The combined system of Killian and Alexander does not disclose a display function for switching between broadcast frequency and cable frequency. Sakakibara discloses in Figure 3, an over the air antenna 34, cable input 35 and a switch 36 (column 2, lines 9-15). Therefore it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of invention to modify the Java controlled switching apparatus of the combined system of Killian and Alexander to accept and switch between both CATV and over the air broadcasts as taught by Sakakibara in order to allow a television view to still watch cable TV programming even

if the CATV line goes out of service and to allow for the viewing of stations not carried by a CATV provider.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.


U.S. Patent 6,005,565 to Legall: Integrated Search of Electronic Program Guide, Internet and Other Information Resources.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Hunter B. Lonsberry whose telephone number is 703-305-3234. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday normal business hours.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Andrew Faile can be reached on 703-305-4380. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-308-5359 for regular communications and 703-872-9314 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-306-0377.

HBL
January 8, 2003


ANDREW FAILE
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600